



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/870,428	05/30/2001	Thomas Alan Slopsema	GP-301083	7065	
7	2590 03/11	003			
	ER DEVRIES		EXAM	EXAMINER	
General Motor Legal Staff, M	s Corporation ail Code 482-C23	321	CASTRO,	CASTRO, ARNOLD	
P.O. Box 300 Detroit, MI 48265-3000			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Detion, wir 4	8203-3000		3747		
			DATE MAILED: 03/11/2003	DATE MAILED: 03/11/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	2
Advisory Action	09/870,428	SLOPSEMA ET AL.	
,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Arnold Castro	3747	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 04 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to ave final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the control o	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the approperation of the fee. The appropriation of the final th	on. See MPEP opriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or
(2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	FR 1.704(b).		ction, even if
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	s.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-21</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)⊡ approved or b)⊡ disapp	roved by the Exami	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	•	
10. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	<u></u>	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not germane to the claimed invention. Applicant argued that Gospodar is silent and does not teach or suggest a computerized controller to control a throttle. The examiner agrees in fact at the time of Gospodar's invention electronic controllers did not exist. However, applicant does not claim a computerized throttle controller, as one of ordinary skill in the art today would consider to be an electrical throttle. Applicants claim invention encompasses mechanical throttle valves as shown in Gospodar. All applicant is claim to be computerized is the closing of the throttle valve at shut down. "a computerized controller configured to control said throttle such that a substantial termination of said intake charge of air is provided during shutdown" Computerizing the control of the switch that controls the electromagnet (12,13) of Gospodar would suffice for anticipation of claimed invention. Nyfelt teaches using a computer to control an ignition switch to shutdown a car. The switch is performing the same function in both Gospodar and Nyfelt. Motivation has been cited. The claim rejection stand for these reasons.

Henry C. Yuen
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700